

**PATENT**  
Atty. Dkt. No: ROC920010306US1  
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10306

### REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 13, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 13, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, paragraphs 6, 49, 51, and 57 have been amended to correct minor editorial problems. In addition, Applicants' Response to Office Action filed on October 29, 2004 inadvertently included two requests replace paragraph [0049], and the final replacement paragraph did not include a signal indicating the paragraph being replaced. Accordingly, replacement paragraphs for paragraphs 49, 51, and 57 are included in this response to prevent any confusion regarding the requested amendments. The amendments in these paragraphs, above, reflect amendments made to the paragraphs as they appeared in the original specification.

Claims 1-4, 7-15, 17-28 and 30-36 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 7-15, 17-20, 22-28 and 30-36 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 3, 14, 17, 25, and 34-36 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, 14-15, 17, 19, 20, 22-26, 28 and 30-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by *Netscape® Communicator 4.75*, copyright 2000 (Screenshot 1) (hereinafter *Communicator*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The present claims are directed to controlling a first browser window (the controlled browser window) from a second browser window (the controlling browser window). In a specific embodiment, Applicants claim opening a controlling browser window configured to control aspects of a controlled browser window that include both the functional aspects and visual aspects of the controlled browser window. For

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No: ROC920010306US1  
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10306

example, at paragraph 31, the specification describes the control that the controlling window may exert to include:

the control window may restrict a user's ability to configure the graphical user interface of the browser program 240, change the appearance of the graphical user interface, prevent access to one or more network addresses, lock one or more keyboard buttons, lock one or more mouse buttons, etc.

*Specification, ¶ 31.*

Respectfully, *Communicator* does not teach control of a first window from a second. In rejecting claims 1, 14, 25 and 34, the Examiner cites to screenshots taken of the *Communicator* program being used to display a web-page, and then selecting a link on the displayed webpage to open a second browser window. In particular, the link to the second browser window is activated using a context sensitive menu choice "Open Link in New Window." Applicants' concede that the Examiner has accurately described using the *Communicator* program to open a new window. However, once the second window is opened, (e.g., screenshot 3 of the *Communicator* program) the original browser window (e.g., screenshot 2 of the *Communicator* program) fails to exert any control or influence over the second browser window. A user is free to engage in any action provided by the *Communicator* program, without any restriction or control effectuated by the first browser window. Further, in processing the "open link in new window" menu selection, the first browser window (screenshot 2) fails to exert any control over the visual appearance of the second browser window (screenshot 3).

Further, even absent the present amendments claims 1, 14 and 25 are patentable over *Communicator* because these claims recite that the controlling window is hidden while the controlled window is opened. While *Communicator* teaches that a window may be minimized, a controlled window is not opened from within the minimized window, nor does the minimized window exert any control over the opened controlled window.

Accordingly, at least with respect to claims 1, 14 and 25 Applicants submit that the claims are allowable without amendments. Nevertheless, in the interest of the swift prosecution of this Application, Applicants have amended claims 1, 14, and 25.

Page 12

351785\_1

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No: ROC920010306US1  
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10306

However, as the amendments are not made for reasons of patentability, Applicants submit these claims are entitled to their full range of equivalents.

Regarding claims 2-4, 7, 9-12, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25 26, 28, 30-33, 35-36, each of these claims is a dependent from one of claims 1, 14, 25 or 34. Applicants submit that because *Communicator* fails anticipate Applicants' invention as claimed in claims 1, 14, 25 and 34, for the reasons stated above, the rejection of these claims is obviated without the need for further remarks.

Applicants submit, therefore, that claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, 14-15, 17, 19-20, 22-26, 28 and 30-36 are patentable over *Communicator*. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 8, 13, 18 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Communicator*, (Screenshot 1), as applied to claims 1, 14 and 25 above, and *Hodgkinson*, U.S. Publication 2002/0016802. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding claims 8, 13, 18, and 27, each of these claims depends from one of claims 1, 14, and 25. Applicants submit that because *Communicator* fails to anticipate Applicants' invention, as claimed in claims 1, 14, and 25, for the reasons stated above, the rejection of these claims is obviated without the need for further remarks. Applicants submit, therefore, that claims 8, 13, 18, and 27 are patentable over *Communicator* in view of *Hodgkinson*, and respectfully request, therefore, that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.


#### **Conclusion**

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

**PATENT**  
Atty. Dkt. No: ROC920010306US1  
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10306

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gero G. McClellan

Registration No. 44,227

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicants